

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided in the present application. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 2, 12, 14, 18, 20-22, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 12, 14, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are independent. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Specifically, the subject matter of claims 2-4, 6-11, 14-16, 18, 21 and 24-28 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 12 and 13 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent format to address all of the informalities cited by the Examiner. In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, and as indicated by the Examiner, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6-16, 18, 21 and 24-28 should be allowed. In addition, as discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants submit that all of the claims of the present application should be allowed and the application should be passed to Issue.

Minor Informalities

Claim 2 has been objected to by the Examiner due to the presence of potential informalities with the claim. This objection is traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments have been made to merely clarify the claimed invention for the benefit of the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments have been made to merely clarify the claimed invention for the benefit of the Examiner.

Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, Applicants have incorporated the changes recommended by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the requested changes do not appear to either raise a substantial question

of the patentability of the claimed invention nor do they narrow the scope of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kawada (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0148556). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the unique combination of elements of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Kawada fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the limitation(s) of: "A system for handling *an adhesive coated sheet media*, comprising. . .an activation device for releasing an encapsulated adhesive as *sheet media* is moved past the activation device by the feeder; *and a release liner device* for laminating with *at least one adhesive side of the sheet media* and transporting the sheet media through a travel path." (emphasis added) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 22, Applicants submit that Kawada fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements of the claimed invention, including the limitation(s) of: "A method for transporting *a sheet media having an at least one adhesive side*, comprising the steps of. . .*providing a sheet media having the at least one adhesive side. . .rupturing the encapsulated adhesive as the sheet media moves past the activation device; laminating the at least one adhesive side of the sheet media with a release liner device; and.*" *transporting the sheet media to a subsequent process step with said release liner device.*" (*emphasis added*) Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The claimed invention is clearly directed toward a complete system for handling an adhesive coated (encapsulated) sheet media. In contrast, Kawada is clearly directed toward a hand held labeler device, e.g., directed toward a continuous narrow length of tape. Further, Kawada does not appear to teach or suggest a labeler device that incorporates a release liner device for transporting the sheet media device, i.e., laminating the at least one adhesive side of the sheet media with a release liner device. In contrast, Kawada appears to specifically avoid any type of releaser liner or release liner device.

Further, Kawada is directed merely toward the destruction/activation of microencapsulated adhesive by applying pressure with rolls, e.g., press roll activation mechanism (element 16 in Kawada). However, Kawada is not

directed toward an activation device that incorporates any shearing action to the encapsulated adhesives. For example, the pressure application of Kawada does not produce a shear force but instead a force normal to the point of application. The present inventors have determined that the shearing action of the activation device of the claimed invention produces smoother and more even activation and spreading of the encapsulated adhesive.

In accordance with the above discussion of the patents relied upon by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that these documents, either in combination together or standing alone, fail to teach or suggest the invention as is set forth by the claims of the instant application.

As to the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional limitations provided by these claims.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Docket No. 0011-0374P
Appl. No.: 09/994,047
Art Unit: 3745

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.


In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Matthew T. Shanley, Registration No. 47,074 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$110.00** is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Reg. No. 32,334

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000


KM/MTS/cl